

emitting elements having gaps between the light emitting elements.” However, first conductor 200 in Fig. 1 in Jones does not appear to have any gaps, as required in Claim 79, and there has been no showing by the Examiner where such gaps are allegedly disclosed in Jones. Hence, Jones does not disclose or suggest this claimed element.

Claim 79 also recites the feature of “a continuous transparent electrode disposed above the layer of OLED material.” The Examiner contends that Jones teaches in figure 1 “a continuous transparent electrode (510) disposed above the layer of OLED material [300].” However, electrode 510 in Fig. 1 in Jones is *not continuous* as it is disconnected at channel 700. Hence, Jones does not disclose or suggest this claimed element.

Claim 79 further recites the feature of “a light-absorbing auxiliary electrode that is thermally and electrically conductive and in electrical and thermal contact with the continuous transparent electrode and located over the gaps between the light emitting elements of the display.” The Examiner contends the Jones teaches in figure 1 “a light-absorbing auxiliary electrode (520) that is thermally and electrically conductive and in electrical and thermal contact with the continuous transparent electrode and located over the gaps between the light emitting elements of the display.” Initially, Applicants note that no such gaps have been shown in the office action, and no such gaps appear to be shown in Jones. Even if one were to assume that channel 700 in Jones corresponds to the claimed gaps (which Applicants do not admit), conductive rib 520 is not located over these “gaps.” Applicants note that the term “located over the gaps” should be construed to mean “located near the gaps and at least partially overlapping the gaps.” See e.g. Fig. 1 of the present application and col. 2, lines 58-50 of US 6,812,637 (from which Claim 79 was copied in order to suggest an interference with the ‘637 patent). Hence, Jones does not disclose or suggest this claimed element.

Therefore, independent Claim 79 is not disclosed or suggested by Jones, and Claim 79 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Jones. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Interference Suggestion

On October 28, 2005, Applicants filed an Interference Suggestion in the present application with regard to US 6,812,637. Pending Claims 79-85 in the present application are either identical or substantially similar to claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9 and 10 of the '637 patent.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully suggest the declaration of an interference between the present application and issued patent USP 6,812,637 (Cok), for at least the reasons explained in depth in the Interference Suggestion of October 28, 2005.

#### Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance.

It is respectfully requested that an interference be declared at this time between the present application and the '637 patent.

If any fee should be due for this response, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: January 18, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.  
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500  
Customer No. 26568